



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/864,199	05/25/2001	Wang Ming Cheng		1631

7590 03/01/2005
WANG Ming Cheng
P.O. Box 82-144
Taipei,
TAIWAN

EXAMINER

AKPATI, ODAICHE T

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2135

DATE MAILED: 03/01/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/864,199

Applicant(s)

CHENG, WANG MING

Examiner

Tracey Akpati

Art Unit

2135

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1 and 2 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1 and 2 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 25 May 2001 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date ____.
- ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date ____.
- ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- ☐ Other: ____.

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1 and 2 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Smith (6055592) in view of Murray (5297200).

With respect to Claim 1, Smith meets the limitation of “an electric lock arrangement comprising a circuit board mounted inside an optical mouse and electrically connected to the internal circuit of the optical mouse is connected, said circuit board comprising: at least one interface connector, said at least one interface connector comprising an insertion slot electrically connected to the internal circuit of the optical mouse, and two upright spring rods perpendicularly extended from a top sidewall thereof at two sides of said insertion slot, said upright spring rods each having a horizontally inwardly extended protruding portion” in Figs. 1 and 2 and on column 2, lines 41-45; and “an encryption card for insertion into one of said at least one interface connector to provide a code signal to the computer for enabling the computer to copy a coded software” is met on column 3, lines 6-10. A circuit board is present within the mouse in Fig. 1. A circuit board is a necessary framework that the other internal components of the mouse (ref. no. 100 of Fig. 2) rest on. The mouse is connected to a computer system as disclosed on column 2, lines 41-45. An interface connector is obvious because the mouse has an insertion slot. The insertion slot is a part of the interface connector. The spring rods are obvious

Art Unit: 2135

because they are a basic feature of a lock arrangement. Enabling the computer to copy a coded software is disclosed on column 2, lines 38-47. The user is prevented from copying a software stored on the system by denying the user access to the system if he fails authentication. Smith discloses an encryption card (see Fig. 1 and column 1, lines 61-63), but does not show a detailed hardware profile.

Murray meets the limitation of "said encryption card comprising two retaining recesses respectively disposed in two opposite vertical sidewalls thereof and adapted to receive the horizontally inwardly extended protruding portion of each of the upright spring rods of one of said at least one interface connector, and a plug unit for insertion into the insertion slot of one of said at least one interface connector to electrically connect said encryption card to the optical mouse and the computer" is met on column 2, lines 18-22, 38-54; and in Fig. 2. Murray discloses a more detailed encryption card structure in this referenced section. The above detailed structure limitation of the encryption card is obvious over the given reference.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of Murray within the system of Smith so as to allow for the encryption card to fit snugly within the mouse's card slot.

With respect to Claim 2, Smith meets all the limitation except for the following limitation.

The limitation of "retaining recesses of said encryption card have a rounded shape, and the horizontally inwardly extended protruding portion of each of the upright spring rods of each

Art Unit: 2135

of said at least one interface connector has a rounded shape fitting the rounded shape of the retaining recesses of said encryption card" is met by Murray on Fig. 2.


It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of Murray within the system of Smith so as to allow for the encryption card to fit snugly within the mouse's card slot.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Tracey Akpati whose telephone number is 571-272-3846. The examiner can normally be reached on 8.30am-6.00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kim Vu can be reached on 571-272-3859. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

OTA


KIM VU
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100